



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,975	02/20/2004	Yves Claude Nicolau	54341-0212 (297752)	4393
23370	7590	10/21/2005	EXAMINER	
JOHN S. PRATT, ESQ KILPATRICK STOCKTON, LLP 1100 PEACHTREE STREET ATLANTA, GA 30309			KIM, YUNSOO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1644	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/783,975	Applicant(s) NICOLAU ET AL.	
	Examiner Yunsoo Kim	Art Unit 1644	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 7/26/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

2

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 are pending.
2. Applicants' claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged.
3. Applicants are invited to submit IDS for consideration.
4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The "supramolecular structure" recited in claim 3 has no antecedent basis in the base claims 1 and 2. The bases claims recite "supramolecular constructs".
6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.
7. Claims 1-4 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1, 3, 4 and 6 of copending Application No. 10/958,211. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.
8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 1644

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,521,211.

The '211 patent teaches a stock lipid of **DPPE**(dipalmitoyl-phosphatidyl ethanolamine)-**PEG-KQAGDV** (see col. 136, lines 31-55, Example 62).

The recitation of intended use of the claimed invention, "may be used to treat disorders" in claim 4 does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art as they are structurally identical.

As noted in the specification p. 15, 1st paragraph, the supramolecular antigenic construct comprises a polypeptide, pegylated lysine (boldfaced) and phosphatidyl ethanolamine, and the palmitic acid is preferred species and encompassed by the invention. Thus, the reference teachings anticipate the claimed invention.

10. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,885,613.

The '613 patent teaches a bilayer stabilizing components (i.e. polyethylene glycol conjugated to phosphatidylethanolamine, col. 8, lines 60-65) and the bilayer stabilizing components can be coupled to a protein or peptide (col. 10, lines 4-15).

The '613 patent further teaches a fusogenic liposome comprising phospholipids and cholesterol (claims 1-7) and the fusogenic liposome is used to deliver drugs, peptide or protein (abstract). The referenced construct "DOPE:cholesterol:DMPE-PEG" as taught in Description of Fig. 4 (col. 4, lines 28-33) meets the limitation of claimed invention as "supramolecular construct reconstituted in liposome" because the specification does not limit to any specific forms of reconstitution (i.e. encapsulation). Thus, the reference teachings anticipate the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1644

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

12. Claims 1-4 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/461,864. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims encompass a composition comprising antigenic peptide and lipophilic moiety.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

13. Claims 1-4 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2 and 5 of copending Application No. 10/958,211. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims encompass a composition comprising antigenic peptide and polyethylene glycol. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.


14. No claims are allowable.

Art Unit: 1644

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yunsoo Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-3176. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8:30 - 5:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Yunsoo Kim
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600
October 4, 2005


Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Technology Center 1600